

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LIBRARY SCHOOLS

PROCEEDINGS

Albany, N.Y.

June 28, 1924

THE LIBRARY OF THE

AUG 29 1924

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

A meeting of the Association of American Library Schools was held Saturday, June 28, 1924 in Albany, N. Y., as guests of the New York State Library School. Mrs. Harriet P. Sawyer, President, presided.

Program

Minutes of last meeting and report of Secretary-Treasurer.

Committee reports:

On standardization of credits, Miss Simpson, chrm.
Miss Rathbone, Miss Sanderson

On cataloging instruction, Miss Howe, chrm.
Miss Sutliff, Miss Rhodes

On degrees, Mr Wyer, chrm.
Miss Donnelly, Mr Windsor

To define equivalent of "4 year high school" as used
in constitution of A.A.L.S., Miss Rathbone, chrm.
Miss Brotherton, Miss Barker

To study field work, Miss Donnelly, chrm.
Miss Hazeltine, Miss Horton

On book selection, Miss Bacon, chrm.
Miss Haines, Miss Crumley

Report of Executive Committee on applications for membership

Report of Executive Committee on reexamination of member
schools

General discussion of the report of the Temporary Training
Board

Election of officers

824202

ATTENDANCE

Eleven of the member schools were represented by the following faculty members:

CARNEGIE LIBRARY SCHOOL, PITTSBURGH

Mr. John H. Leete, Miss Nina C. Brotherton, Miss Esther Betz, Miss Martha Conner.

LIBRARY SCHOOL, CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF ATLANTA

Miss Tommie Dora Barker, Miss Susie Lee Crumley.

LIBRARY SCHOOL, LOS ANGELES PUBLIC LIBRARY

(Not represented)

LIBRARY SCHOOL OF THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. Ernest J. Reece, Miss Corinne Bacon, Miss Polly Fenton, Miss Margaret Jackson, Miss Mary L. Sutliff.

LIBRARY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. C. B. Lester, Miss Mary K. Reely.

NEW YORK STATE LIBRARY SCHOOL

Dr. James I. Wyer, Miss Edna M. Sanderson, Mr. Walter S. Biscoe, Miss Mary B. Brewster, Miss Mary Eastwood, Miss Dorcas Fellows, Miss Isabella K. Rhodes, Miss Elizabeth M. Smith, Mr. Frank L. Tolman, Miss Margaret S. Williams, Miss Florence Woodworth.

PRATT INSTITUTE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

Mr. Edward F. Stevens, Miss Edith P. Buckman.

ST. LOUIS LIBRARY SCHOOL

Mr. Arthur E. Bostwick, Mrs. Harriet P. Sawyer, Mr. Charles E. Compton.

SIMMONS COLLEGE, SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

Miss June R. Donnelly, Miss Florence T. Blunt, Miss Harriet E. Howe, Miss Mary E. Hyde.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, LIBRARY SCHOOL

Miss Elisabeth Thorns, Miss Mary E. Robbins.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY SCHOOL

Mr. Phineas L. Windsor, Miss Josie B. Houchens.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON LIBRARY SCHOOL

(Not represented)

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

Miss Alice S. Tyler, Miss Linda A. Eastman, Miss Edith C. Lawrence, Miss Effie L. Power, Miss Bessie Sargeant Smith.

On invitation from the A.A.L.S. the Temporary Library Training Board of the A.L.A. were represented by Miss Linda A. Eastman, Miss Sarah C.N. Bogle, and Miss Harriet E. Howe.

Miss Elva L. Bascom, formerly on the faculty of member schools, was an invited guest.

DIGEST OF PROCEEDINGS

The meeting was called to order by the President.

There was a roll call by schools.

The Secretary read a brief digest of the minutes of the meeting held in New York City, June 25-26, 1923, and the minutes were approved as presented.

STANDARDIZATION OF CREDITS. The following report on standardization of credits, prepared by Miss Simpson, chairman of the committee, was read by Miss Sanderson.

REPORT TO THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LIBRARY SCHOOLS
ON "STANDARDIZATION OF ACADEMIC CREDITS IN LIBRARY SCHOOLS"; AND, "ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST
THE SEMESTER PLAN AS OPPOSED TO THE QUARTER PLAN"

For reasons which will appear later in this report your Committee begs to invert the order of topics and to present the second part of its report as preliminary to the major report. Unless there is objection this report will proceed to state arguments for and against the two plans for dividing the academic year; namely, the semester and the quarter. The major part of this report will follow and will concern itself with a discussion of the schedules of credits now in force in the member schools of this body, and with some suggestions or recommendations concerning desirable modifications. In pursuance of this, it will be found advisable to have before us a clear-cut idea of the length of time presumably devoted to each part of the curriculum and designated as term, quarter, or semester.

PART I

Arguments for and against the semester as opposed to the quarter plan of academic instruction.

The plan earliest in use was probably the three-term one, based upon the three chief seasons of the Christian year, namely, Michaelmas or Fall Term, Lent or Spring Term, and Trinity or Summer Term. These divisions of the scholastic year were and are still used by the great English universities and are still followed by a number of religions, and privately endowed institutions in this and other countries. America naturally followed the example of the mother country, and for over two centuries and a half most of her higher institutions made use of the term plan; this is still followed by a not inconsiderable number of privately endowed, church supported, and smaller colleges.

About twenty-five or thirty years ago, many of the larger American colleges and universities investigated the half-year or semester plan, already in use in some of the continental universities and already adopted by Harvard and some other American colleges, with the result that the half decade between 1895 and 1900 saw a large proportion of state-aided, as well as privately endowed, institutions of higher learning, experimenting with this new plan. It has evidently come to stay, as it has endured now for a quarter of a century and has spread in use through a large part of the American educational world.

In 1918, after the entry of the United States into the World War, for reasons which need not here be gone into, the Federal War and Navy Departments offered to cooperate with American universities and colleges by establishing divisions of the Student Army Training Corps in each cooperating institution. One of the requests made by the Government was that the quarter plan should be used to replace the term or semester plan already in use. This "request" was in practice an order, and the academic year 1918-1919 saw the whole higher educational system of the United States working on the quarter plan. This cooperation with the War and Navy Departments was brought to an abrupt close in December, 1918, by the cessation of hostilities. In an overwhelmingly larger number of cases, the quarter plan lasted during just one academic year, or even for a shorter period. The promptness and unanimity with which University Senates, College Faculties and similar bodies acted have probably never been equalled in educational history! With comparatively few exceptions they voted to return to the former plan whatever that had been. It is not improbable that some of the antipathy manifested toward the quarter plan was induced by a general dislike on the part of educators toward the whole plan of the S. A. T. C., as it worked out in practise, and was not inherent in the quarter plan as such, but the plan went by the board nevertheless, whatever the reason. A few institutions in the Northwest and on the Pacific Coast, notably the University of Washington, and scattering colleges here and there retained the quarter plan, but most of the large state supported universities (Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, California) lost no time in resuming the semester method. Frequently, at recent annual meetings of college and university registrars, representatives of one or two institutions announce a return to the semester plan.

All this in itself might be called "presumptive evidence", in favor of the semester method of division, but there are several specific arguments which can be adduced to support it. Among them are:-

1. From the administrative point of view, the semester plan provides a better and less expensive mechanism. While the "overhead" expense remains practically the same, the additional expense for extra clerical help, copyists, recorders, checkers, etc., is reduced 30 to nearly 50%.
2. For those who believe that more frequent interruptions in a scholastic program are undesirable, the semester plan provides a system with fewer breaks.
3. In the judgment of many educators the semester plan is better adapted to the content of subject matter of academic courses. That, of course, may be said to beg the question, but the fact remains that by far the greater majority of educational people prefer the semester plan because it allows courses to be given with time for

reflection and assimilation between presentations of new material. For example, a semester course in, say, introduction to economics, may be given three (3) times a week for eighteen (18) weeks, where the semester plan prevails. Whereas, the quarter plan would require that the same course be given four (4) or five (5) times a week for twelve (12) weeks.

The registrar of an institution (the Carnegie Institute of Technology at Pittsburgh) which tried out the quarter plan for three years and then gave it up, has summed up the reasons for discarding the quarter system as follows;; some of these reasons seem particularly applicable to library school conditions;

1. The departments did not, to any great extent, avail themselves of the opportunity of scheduling students for a smaller number of courses, given intensively for one quarter, which was one of the advantages claimed for the quarter system.
2. There is always a period of uncertainty and necessary waste of time in connection with the individual scheduling of students at the beginning of each school term. On the semester plan there are only two such periods as opposed to three on the quarter basis.
3. There would be a saving of time and labor in scheduling students, in examinations, in recording grades and in receiving fees.
4. There would be a smaller proportionate amount of distractions due to holidays, in the longer term.
5. The extra week used in the third (or second) examination would provide an opportunity for inspection trips. (This applies equally well to those library schools which require visits of inspection during the winter or spring).
6. One of the arguments usually advanced in favor of the four-quarter plan is that it provides an opportunity for a student to shorten his four-year period in college. Our experience proves that in the case of our students at least, there is very little desire to shorten this period. In fact, the tendency of our own students is to use their summer vacation for earning money to continue their courses and in getting practical experience in engineering and industrial fields. We have found that our present eight weeks summer session serves its purpose just as well with the two semester plan as it would serve its purpose with the three-quarter plan; in the majority of cases, each

subject in the summer session is equivalent to the work of a semester by being scheduled, during the eight weeks session, for twice the usual number of hours a week. We have found, also, that our students are not willing to give up the entire summer period of twelve weeks, but will attend the eight weeks session if such procedure is necessary or advantageous for them.

(Signed by the Registrar of
Carnegie Institute of Technology,
Pittsburgh.)

The defenders of the quarter plan on the other hand claim:

1. That it is less expensive because the plant does not remain idle and unproductive during three summer months or longer, as is the case where the semester plan is followed, but is in constant operation. This, however, makes no allowance for the fact that many of our institutions now operating on the semester plan offer each summer a six, eight or nine weeks summer session, which in effect offsets the foregoing argument.
2. That the divisions of the academic year necessitated by the various holiday recesses are easily adaptable to the quarter plan. This apparently leaves out of consideration the fact that the Easter recess is a movable one, and often seriously interferes with the length of the two adjacent quarters. If this is met by a counter objection that the Easter recess need not be one of the termini of the quarter, then we are confronted with the practical question, "What shall we do with the students who for religious or other reasons demand an excused absence on Good Friday?" This, as we all know, usually means Saturday and Easter Monday, practically an Easter vacation in addition to the week between the winter and spring quarters.
3. That the quarter plan permits of intensive arrangement for curricula, necessitating five (5) or six (6) lecture periods per week for major subjects, while the semester plan arranges for three (3) or at most four (4) meetings per week.

The University of Chicago is perhaps the best known protagonist for the quarter plan, as it has never used any other since its establishment in 1893, and its strongest and most frequently reiterated argument is that of a five-hour major each week throughout the quarter. Apparently then educational authorities differ fundamentally at this point.

-8-

The preponderance of arguments seem to be in favor of the semester plan assaagainst the quarter plan.

For those library schools which have a more or less vital connection with a larger educational unit, it is quite likely that the question is already settled, and that the respective administrative authorities will not re-open it. The matter is probably out of our hands, and we have nothing to do but accommodate our plans to the one already adopted. Those schools which are independent of any formal educational establishment, those which are privately endowed or administered through a city library, doubtless have considerable freedom of action and can choose for themselves their plan of division. After all is said the essential question is not that of the semester or the quarter plan of division - which? - for quarter credits can easily be reduced to semester credits and semester credits enlarged to equivalent quarter hours; it is a simple matter of fractions. The vital matter, however, is that each teaching body shall see to it that its curriculum is based upon a currently accepted academic division of the scholastic year, and shall plan its courses in accordance with that unit. In other words, we should "cut our garments to fit our cloth". If our printed official statements may be trusted to present this matter correctly, some of us need to draft a new pattern for future garments.

PART II

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDIZATION OF CREDITS IN
LIBRARY SCHOOLS, TO THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN
LIBRARY SCHOOLS

Your Committee, as it has interpreted its office, has not understood that among its functions, lie any discussions of content of curricula, except as, incidentally, such discussion becomes an essential part of the analysis of a credit schedule. Neither has it made any attempt to analyze credit values of courses as among respective schools. It has attempted to examine schedules of curricula as indicated in the printed announcements of the member schools of this Association, and to indicate whether the statements of credit hours were such as to stand academic scrutiny.

Academic practise has already defined a "credit" as implying one (1) clock hour (50-55 minutes) of lecture, recitation or report per week, per semester, term or quarter, and presupposing Two (2) clock hours of preparation for each hour of credit. In most institutions of higher learning, one (1) credit hour is allowed for three (3) clock hours of laboratory work.

This method of computing values toward graduation is usually restricted to undergraduate colleges and is occasionally, though by no means uniformly, employed by professional schools. The term is not commonly used for graduate courses nor to indicate value in secondary schools. In a report presented to this Association in 1919, by a Committee on Definitions of Terms, Miss Bogle, Chairman, a definition of credit almost identical with the foregoing was submitted, so that the question of definition needs no further discussion at this time. The term is a convenient one, is one in general educational use and might well be not only formally adopted, but actually used (which it does not seem to be) by the member Schools of this Association. It should be stated, however, that your Committee found less variation in printed statements than it had anticipated, though several of the printed schedules of courses and hours attached, prove upon examination to be clock hours and not credit hours. If our official circulars are to mean anything to the general educational world, they must be at least consistent in their own statements. This report does not recommend uniformity of credits, course for course among our Schools. That has not been a part of its duties as these have been understood.

This Committee has tried to examine carefully the statements of Library School practise as given in their official publications; and to determine how these statements are related to accepted academic practise. In pursuance of this object, it has been necessary to go into some detail, more or less wearisome, but this could hardly have been avoided. The general summing up of results will, it is hoped, present a clearly defined series of desirable modifications.

1. The placing and sequence of courses in term programs.

An academic credit has just been defined as one (1) hour (50 minutes) of lecture, etc., per week, per semester, quarter, or term. This would presuppose then a division of the scholastic year into semesters, terms, or quarters; but an examination of circulars seems to show that several members of this Association, except for a preliminary statement in connection with the school calendar, have omitted all further reference to any division of the year. From reading the customary description of courses, one is unable to learn definitely concerning the academic calendar division in which any given subject is taught; or, which is much more serious, the sequence of courses. Is the reader to understand that courses are given in the order in which stated in the formal description? This would throw most of the heaviest work at the same time, such poor pedagogy that it cannot possibly be so intended. One circular, (Atlanta), gives as its first course described, Lectures on library buildings. Of course that subject is probably presented rather late in the term of year, but it is described first in the 1923-24 circular. Does the course in Public Documents precede or follow the one in general reference? Other instances might be cited.

Three member Schools (Atlanta, Pratt and Western Reserve), do not indicate in their official circulars in what part of the year any given subject is presented or whether it is completed in one semester or term, or carried over into another. Unless these facts are definitely stated in official publications, it will be difficult to reduce clock hours to credits or to compute values of courses on a credit basis.

2. Number of clock hours vs. number of credit hours.

If an academic year is divided into fractional parts, as two semesters, three terms, four quarters, (of which three only are used in library school practise) then it follows that the whole number of class exercises per semester, term, etc., should bear some mathematical relation to the whole number of weeks in each division of the year; that is, if we are to accept the definition of a credit hour already cited. Here is where our rule is "more honored in the breach than in the observance". Even Schools which are closely connected with academic institutions apparently ignore any obligation to plan their schedules according to their academic calendar. One semester should mean 18 weeks; one quarter should equal 12 weeks, the week of examination usually being included. Unfortunately one term cannot always be understood to mean a certain definite number of weeks. One school (Western Reserve) which is apparently working on a semester or two-term plan, states some of its courses as follows: Reference 30 hours (30 is not a multiple of 18); government publications 10 hours (10 is not a multiple of 18); book selection 60 hours; cataloging 63 hours; classification 37 hours (this is not so far out of order, as 36 hours would indicate a two-credit course, or twice a week for 18 weeks). This method of educational bookkeeping must involve considerable editing somewhere between the office of the Library School and the Registrar's files. Another School (Pratt) departs from academic procedure when on a three-term calendar, it indicates values of courses as 34 hours, 25 hours, 44 hours, 18 hours, 120 hours, 10 hours, etc. To help the reader, a table of equivalents giving credit hours for clock hours is provided on pages 13 and 14 of the 1934-1935 circular, which totals 33 credit hours. There seem to be some inconsistencies in the working out of this table, but no doubt these can be explained and they are not significant. It would be only a short step in advance for this school (Pratt) to adopt a credit basis for its schedule.

A third School (Atlanta) neither shows any division into terms, beyond a preliminary note in the school calendar, nor is there any apparent attempt to make use of a credit system. There is no required minimum of credit for graduation stated, so far as could be learned from a recent circular, and hours are tabulated as follows: 6, 25, 13, 71, 64, 17, 30, 23, 47, 21, 322, etc. It would be an irritating task for a college registrar's office to translate

such a schedule into a credit system and evaluate the same, and some registrars would undoubtedly consider themselves justified in refusing to approve a transfer of credit stated in those terms.

Another school (Los Angeles) on the semester plan, does not in its circular show a proportional connection between its clock hours and its semester hours. The 1923-24 circular cites hours assigned to courses as follows: Book selection, 2, 33 hours, both semesters; b, 12 hours, 2nd semester; c, 24 hours, both semesters, and a 4th division of the subject, 16 hours both semesters; history of books and printing, 5 hours, 1st semester; public documents, 10 hours, 2nd semester; reference 40 hours, both semesters; etc. (N. B. Query: does "both semesters" signify "each" semester, or is it used as an aggregate?)

3. Fractional Credits. It is a commonly accepted axiom among educators that fractional credits are to be avoided if possible. Many registrars refuse to approve their entry because of annoying possibilities of mistakes in college records, and college faculties disapprove of the practise of minimizing the value of a course by allotting so slight an amount of time to its presentation. New York State School in its recently adopted crediting system has unfortunately allowed four (4) fractional courses to be included in its plan among its required junior courses, according to the 1923-24 circular. By a little transferring or combining, such difficulties might have been avoided.

4. One-credit courses. Another practise tabooed by our elders in the educational world is that of multiplying one-credit courses. Courses given but once a week are not approved by the best educational judgment and might better be combined with other minor subjects into a two-credit course for one or two semesters or terms. The same criticism which attacks fractional courses, applies in this connection. New York State, Illinois, New York City, St. Louis, Syracuse, Wisconsin, Washington, Western Reserve, in fact, all Schools which follow more or less consistently the credit plan, fail here. Washington probably has the smallest number of one-credit courses, one; and Illinois in her revised curriculum now in press, will show a marked improvement in this matter.

The circulars of Pittsburgh, Atlanta and Los Angeles are not sufficiently explicit as to their practise in this matter.

5. The course less than one semester or quarter. Whatever has been said in criticism of the plan of using fractional or one-hour courses can be urged with increased emphasis against that of the so-called "courses" covering four, five, seven, nine, etc., clock hours. A course as defined in educational terminology should mean the study of a subject, presented not less

frequently than once a week and continuing through an entire semester or quarter. Most of the Schools which depend on the clock hour to state the values of their courses, are guilty of this violation of educational procedure, and lay themselves open to serious criticism. A "course" calling its class together four times during a semester or year is an educational paradox, unless the work is that of an advanced seminar presuming the preparation of elaborate reports by mature students. The Library School subjects often designated and described as courses do not fall into such a category.

Library Schools are more or less on the defensive these days as a part of the educational system; our work is not the mystery which it appeared to be twenty years ago; we must show cause if we are to continue to receive worthwhile recognition and support; we are the objects of critical examination, not all of which is perhaps sympathetic, not all of which is even intelligent, but some of which is fairly directed. We cannot afford not to conform to recognized educational standards.

6. Extra-curricular requirements. In institutions, extra-curricular requirements, such as visits of inspection to engineering plants, municipal water and lighting systems, mines, etc., on the part of students in colleges of engineering; and visits of advanced students of sociology to penal, philanthropic and other social institutions, are given not only definite place in a curriculum, but receive definite credit, either as part of a major subject or as a minor course, counting for a minimum credit. Since similar requirements are enforced in the case of Library Schools, a similar practise might be followed advantageously. This is done in the case of several Schools, but others make no mention beyond a statement of the requirement as such, and do not link it up with the curriculum.

At the suggestion of one member of the Committee, two appendices have been affixed to this report, showing in a tabulated form two outlines of courses with academic credit attached. One of these outlines, Appendix A, was taken verbatim from a recent circular issued by the St. Louis Library School, which follows the semester plan in the division of its school year, and uses semester credit hours. The second, Appendix B, was compiled from an official register of the University of Washington, restating in schedule form the courses as given by a School which uses the quarter plan and the quarter credits.

Your Committee therefore submits the following recommendations:

1. That the use of the academic credit hour be urged for general adoption.
2. That the instructional value of each course be stated in credit terms not in clock hours.

3. That the use of fractional credits be avoided.
4. That the inclusion of one-credit courses be reduced to a minimum.
5. That the Association of American Library Schools disapprove the practise of calling by the term course short groups of lectures on minor subjects and suggest that these be combined into larger groups of related subjects.
6. That extra-curricular requirements, lectures by visiting librarians, and the like, either be restated as minor courses with such credit value as each School may fix for itself; or be made to form a part of a larger whole and be given time allowance in planning the curriculum.
7. That in issuing future announcements the member Schools bear in mind the desirability of stating the place in academic year and the sequence of the various courses which form the curricula.

After these recommendations have been submitted to our Library School faculties and have been given adequate consideration, it will then be possible, perhaps, to agree on credit for individual courses in respective schools, though with regard to the wisdom of unanimity, supposing that to be attainable in the future, your Committee expresses no opinion.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) Josephine Rathbone
Edna M. Sanderson
Frances Simpson, Chairman

28 June 1924

APPENDIX A

ST. LOUIS PUBLIC LIBRARY SCHOOL OUTLINE OF COURSES

First Semester

	Hours per week	
Administration of libraries	2	
Book Selection	2	
Bookbinding and printing	1	
Cataloging	2	
Classification	2	
Current events and periodicals	1	
Laboratory work	2	
Reference	2	
Trade bibliography	1	15

(Appendix A)

Second Semester

	Hours per week	
History of libraries	1	
Book selection	3	
Library economy	1	
Cataloging	2	
Loan work	1	
Periodicals and library news	1	
Laboratory work	2	
Reference	3	
Subject bibliography	<u>3</u>	17

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON LIBRARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM

(Quarter Plan)

Autumn Quarter

Library Science	Credits	
174 - Order, Trade Bibliography, Loan etc	2	
175 - Classification & Subject Headings	3	
176 - Cataloging	3	
177 - Reference	2	
178 - History of Books and Libraries	2	
179 - Book selection	<u>3</u>	15

Winter Quarter

184 - Cataloging	3	
185 - Reference	2	
186 - Practice	5	
187 - Organization and Extension	2	
188 - Book selection	2	
189 - Work with Children and Schools	<u>2</u>	16

Spring Quarter

193 - Reference	2	
194 - Subject Bibliography	2	
195 - Practice	5	
196 - Book Selection	2	
197 - Library Administration & Library Literature ..	3	
198 - Special Lectures by Active Librarians	<u>1</u>	15
	Total	<u>46</u>

46 Quarter credits = 30 2/3 Semester credits

Miss Robbins stated that there were no one-hour courses to be given at Syracuse this year.

Miss Donnelly questioned the criticism of Western Reserve calling 30 hours a course. Thinks Harvard does.

Mr. Windsor thought this partly justified. No recesses in summer and so 30 is often the number of class meetings. Holidays during the regular winter session might easily cut the number of class periods to 30.

Miss Tyler asked of recommendation number 4 (i.e. that the inclusion of one-credit courses be reduced to a minimum) had been worked out.

Miss Sanderson said, "No", but suggested combining several shorter courses under one general item.

Miss Conner asked how practice work is credited.

Mr. Windsor answered that one credit hour for three hours supervised practice work is a common practice and is so counted in Illinois.

Miss Lester stated that Wisconsin agrees with Illinois.

Miss Tyler moved that the report be accepted. Motion was seconded and carried.

Mr. Windsor called attention to the fact that the report makes specific recommendations and moved that the members of the Association consider these carefully and pass on these recommendations either immediately or at a future meeting.

Mr. Reece seconded the motion but thought time for faculty consideration and conference necessary before actual approval of recommendations.

Miss Tyler thought it necessary to have time to think them over.

Mr. Reece said he would suggest an even stronger wording for the motion. He would have the schools consider the recommendations with a view to making their observance an actual ruling of the Association.

Mr. Leete offered a substitute motion that the recommendations of the Committee on Standardization of credits be referred to the member schools of the Association for consideration and that the schools report at a future meeting upon the opinion as to the possibility and advisability of adopting these recommendations as requirements of the Association.

The revision of the motion was accepted and was passed.

Cataloging. The following report of the Committee on cataloging instruction was read by Miss Howe, Chairman of the Committee.

.....

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LIBRARY SCHOOLS

Report of the Committee on the
Teaching of Cataloging
in the
Member Schools

Albany, N.Y. June 26, 1924

At the annual meeting of the Association of American Library Schools in New York, June 1923, the Committee on the Teaching of Cataloging presented a Tabulation of the answers to the questionnaire which had been sent out in the fall of 1922 for the Committee, by Mary E. Baker, then a member of it. Miss Baker changed her position before the June meeting, so that the Tabulation was made by the Chairman. The Committee now consists of Mary L. Sutliff, Isabella K. Rhodes, and Harriet E. Howe, Chairman. This Committee, as instructed in the Spring of 1923, has been working on the Tabulation, to draw some conclusions from it.

The first step seemed to be to find out if any changes had been made since the former report, and whether or not the former statements had been interpreted correctly by the Chairman. The schools were asked these questions in October 1923, and by Christmas the answers were all in. The corrections have been made in the Tabulation, and the report submitted herewith is based upon this most recent verification, discussing the points as arranged in the Tabulation.

There seems to be almost unanimity in the schools in regard to the time that cataloging is introduced into the schedule. All begin it at the first of the first semester

except the Carnegie Library School of Pittsburgh.

Cataloging is required at all schools of all students, but at Pittsburgh the type of specialization desired by the student determines how much cataloging shall be required, while at Washington, one of three units of the second quarter is elective. At Los Angeles and New York State, advanced courses are also elective.

The number of students permitted in one section shows great differences in attitude toward this point, as some schools report sections of from 35 to 40 students, one even saying "no limit". The normal size for a class is supposed to be 25 students, even in subjects much less difficult to handle than is cataloging. In a later questionnaire sent out this last Fall, the teachers were asked "Have you tried dividing the class according to the ability of its members?" Some of the answers are interesting in this connection - one from a school having a large class says:

"Have never been able to try out this, because of schedule complications, but I very much desire to do it if I can bring it about. I have never yet had a class that did not vary greatly, and I believe division into two groups to be a very desirable thing."

Still another says:

"We always have some mature students with years of experience in teaching or in library work.

10

The oldest ones have the most difficulty in doing careful, detailed work, and are also far more sensitive than students just out of school about their deficiencies. It would increase their troubles to group them conspicuously in the less competent section of the class, and would be a loss to the other section also, for their background of practical experience enables them to contribute a much needed element to class discussion. Yet they are usually slow and inaccurate workers."

Another answers:

"No. I find that ability to do the work varies so much as the course advances that sometimes the best students at the end are those who knew nothing of the subject at the beginning..."

Subheads to the main question as asked this fall were:

Was division on lines of (1) previous experience or (2) present ability?

If (1) at first, was any change made later to bring all rapid students into one group?

If (2) at first, how was it determined?

Miss Horton's reply for Los Angeles covers these points as follows:

"Division of the class into two sections proved most satisfactory this year. It is economical only in the sense that anything that works to

the advantage of the students is economy. With thirty-two students in the school, 14 were placed in one section and 18 in the other. This division was decided by previous experience. This worked well at first, but several of the quickest and most capable persons were in the beginners' class and were transferred to section two at Thanksgiving. Section one was not slower, but was ignorant of the first steps of cataloging. These students needed more practice in form and more repetition of drills, which naturally bore persons of experience. At Christmas time we find that both classes have reached the same point in knowledge of rules."

Here is proof of the application of this principle to our own field, but if any one still doubts or wants further evidence, he is referred to the article in *School and Society*, April 1, 1923, 7.18:353-6, By Dean Carl E. Seashore, on Sectioning classes on the basis of ability. Dr Seashore contends that the slow student is the one most benefited, because such dividing puts him in a class with others struggling as he is, and he finds there "kindness, comfort, justice and relative efficiency". A larger output of work is possible in each group, partly on grounds of morale, and partly by the eliminating of whatever subject matter is known in the

higher group, and the eliminating of what is at present beyond the grasp of the lower group. Since in library schools we have a selected group, really, our problem would be to let the rapid students have a chance to go as fast as they were able, and the slower ones to learn at their own rate, allowing transfer from one group to the other as the slower ones gained in speed and ability, or the others slackened in effort.

The recommendation of the Committee is, therefore, that the Directors of the Schools take seriously under consideration the number of students to be permitted in one section; that where there are more than two or three above the normal class of 25 that two sections be made; and that these sections be made on the basis of the ability of the students.

The next point on the Tabulation, the number of lecture periods in the courses devoted to cataloging alone, taking 6a and b as well as 4b into consideration, shows a wide range. Since these periods vary so greatly in length also, from 48 to 110 minutes each, it seemed fairer to translate these figures into clock hours, and to see what comparisons could then be made. The following table gives the result:

CLOCK HOURS SPENT IN THE CLASS ROOM DURING THE YEAR

A	C.P.	Ill.	L.A.	N.Y.P.	N.Y.S.	P
71	45	44	31	41	39	124
S.L.	S.	Syr.	Wash.	W.R.	Wis.	
48	61	50	54	50	41	

The clock hour range is from 31 - 124 hours, the median 48 hours, and the average 53 hours, as compared with class periods ranging from 34 - 77 periods, median 53 periods, and average 56 periods, of varying lengths.

The median for preparation time required is two hours, which is the amount used by six schools, four using three hours, and one each using the following, one and three quarters, one and one half hours, and seventy-two minutes.

In order to try to find out how many clock hours were spent on the course, the preparation time was figured in combination with the class room time, taking the above statements (and for the preparation time, answers 4a times 7a) as a basis, with the following result:

CLOCK HOURS FOR CLASS ROOM AND REQUIRED PREPARATION WORK

	A	C.P.	Ill.	L.A.	N.Y.P.	N.Y.S.	
Class	71	hr 45	44	31	41	39	
Prep.	142	135	106	68	100	94	
Total	213	180	150	99	141	133	

	P	S.L.	S	Syr.	Wash.	W.R.	Wis.	
Class	124	48	61	50	54	50	41	hrs.
Prep.	119	87	92 1/2	180	130	150	150	
	243	135	153 1/2	230	184	200	191	hrs.

The median for totals as given here is 180 clock hours, the average 173, with a range from 99 - 243 clock hours devoted to cataloging alone.

This gives a better basis for comparison than the figures on the Tabulation. The facts are not all here even yet, as ten

schools teach theory of subject headings as a part of some other course. However these schools include both those giving a large and a small amount of cataloging, so that the figures would be changed relatively only, probably.

As an example of how these facts differ from the statements on the Tabulation, take the case of Simmons College, where 77 periods, the highest reported, are given to cataloging alone. These periods equal 61 clock hours, which together with the 92 1/2 clock hours of preparation time, gives a total of 153 1/2 clock hours. Therefore from the school which seems to give the highest amount of time to cataloging, Simmons drops to eighth place, its amount being below both the median, 180, and the average, 173. Most of this difference is due to the short preparation time, as the number of class room hours is still above both the median and average, giving Simmons third place on that score, but tenth place in amount of preparation required, and really thirteenth place in amount for each lesson. The number of class room hours at Simmons, then, might be slightly lowered, and the amount of preparation time much lengthened to advantage.

The median of 180 clock hours for cataloging alone might mean 9 hours a week, 3 recitation and 6 preparation hours, for 20 weeks. This amount seems a fair one in view of the already overcrowded curriculum.

The preparation period should be considered also from the point of view of the answers given under 7 c-d. 7c "Is there a

definite period set apart, or merely a definite hour for completion?" 7d "Is there supervision during this period?"

Eight of the schools report a definite time set apart, and seven of these state that there is supervision. Wisconsin has changed its policy, reporting this year "No, but one hour per week set apart when instructor may be consulted. Instructor and revisers . . . always available if consultation is absolutely necessary".

In connection with this, the answers to a question asked this last fall seem to point in a significant way. "How can you judge the comparative speed at which different students work". One teacher says

"Speed plus accuracy is such a desirable combination in a cataloger. You are constantly testing students for accuracy by revising their work. I find estimating speed much harder. If you watch them, it irritates, and makes some students nervous. If you ask for a record of time spent, many students get the impression that spending more time means acquiring more merit."

Another says

"We ask the students to spend only two hours in the preparation of the assignment . . . even though they may work slowly. The comparative speed is judged by the number and the difficulty of the books cataloged. This is not accurate, however, as students admit, later, that they frequently

spent more than the two hours, but did not report it."

Each of these answers came from a school having neither supervision nor a definite period for preparation work. The answers from the teachers using these methods were not nearly so indefinite, because these teachers do know the time, and they receive the work accomplished in it. Since 35 Head Catalogers in large libraries recently so voted that the median amount of speed desired in catalogers is "above average", it would seem necessary for the teachers of the subject to adopt some way to gauge speed as well as accuracy.

In regard to the students resenting or being made nervous by the presence of the instructor, it seems to rest entirely upon the attitude taken by the instructor in initiating the scheme. If she establishes a helpful atmosphere, she may get results like the following:

Student, "This book is great fun! I think I can do it this way ... outlining the plan.... or this way, or this way. Question is, if all are allowable, Which is best?"

A word or two from the instructor brought out some advantages and disadvantages of each plan, but left the student to think out her own method. She was not irritated because the instructor was there, and yet she was a rapid worker and a mature student.

Although the quick student profits by the supervision, the slow one leans hardest. Some critics say "But they ought to

work independently on their own responsibility and not ask questions". In answer one may only say that they do ask questions in unsupervised work, but ask of other students instead of the instructor. Is it not better to have present the one who should know how to guide them, rather than to let them depend on students who must simply answer to the best of their knowledge?

Students in graduate and undergraduate courses in science do not resent the presence of the laboratory assistant. Supervised study is highly recommended, even for adults, by educators. Students taking up cataloging as a career will find the head cataloger on hand in the department for conference and advice. Why not then carry out the preparation work in the library school in conditions as nearly as possible similar to those that will be met later?

This would seem to mean not only the presence of the instructor, but that the students should do this work in the same way that it would be done in a department. Such methods of work should be taught that the student will follow good methods in her after experience. She should know how to prepare work so that the typing of the cards may be done later, by herself or by a typist. She should look up all names used in her work, in order to know what to do when authorities differ or have made mistakes in entry, and in order to record references, etc. Students working habitually under such

conditions do not find the transition from school to department so difficult, nor do the departments find the newcomer so hard to initiate.

The votes of the 35 Head Catalogers quoted above, give weight here also, to the argument that the student should learn to prepare material for a typist to copy. Seventeen voted that typing was not a qualification necessary for the cataloger, marking this as clerical work, while 15 voted for average ability, and only three for superior ability. This shows a marked tendency in the field to have typing done, not by the library school graduate, but by the clerical assistant. This tendency has been growing so steadily that the students must be prepared to meet it, and to initiate it wherever possible. The schools may well afford to watch this tendency, and to lessen emphasis on handwriting and typewriting to meet the new conditions.

The recommendation is made, therefore, that the schools not now using the supervised preparation plan should take it under careful consideration.

In regard to the questions relating to practical experience in the cataloging department during the course, a great variation is shown, but the recommendation would still be to give as much as possible, for in no other way may the student see cataloging as it really is.

In Group 2, questions 1-2 brought answers which show the trend is still to teach different forms of card for different

entries, and not to divide the discussion of form from that of principles. The opinion of the Committee is that it would be well for the schools to experiment with teaching the unit card, since no two libraries, probably, use exactly the same forms of added entry cards, or of main cards even. Why not teach one form only (i.e. the unit card to be modified as is the Library of Congress card) and then later discuss the briefer added entry cards which may be used in some circumstances?

Question 3 shows practical unanimity. Question 4, revision, shows that for 5 schools the instructor does her own revision, in others that she does part of it and in still others there are revisers, whose work is OK'd by the instructor. Some schools, according to the answers to a question asked in the fall of 1923, are experimenting with allowing the students to help in the revision, and their results may be awaited before commenting on that point. If any way can be discovered to avoid the "mountains" of cards appearing after each lesson, all teachers will be singing psalms of joy. Perhaps we are too particular, and should be willing to do as the English teacher often does, take the results of the reader's efforts. Perhaps we should insist upon revisers who have had sufficient experience to do the work correctly with no oversight from the instructor. As the latter scheme calls for more money it is really an administrative problem. The Committee feels strongly that cataloging teachers are overworked, and that the quality

of their work would be much improved if they were allowed a wider margin of leisure for extra-curricular activities.

Since there exists such difference of opinion as to the proper placement for the teaching of subject headings, some schools giving it with classification, some with cataloging, and some as a separate course, the recommendation is made that a committee be appointed to investigate and report on this point.

The following letter was sent to the members of the Editorial Committee of the A.L.A.

April 26, 1924

Gentlemen:

The Committee on the Teaching of Cataloging appointed by the Association of American Library Schools feels that the teaching of subject headings is an important part of the work of the instruction in cataloging, and a part for which at present there is no adequate text-book. The Committee has learned that the preliminary draft of such a text-book has been made by Miss Mary E. Hyde, who by successful experience in a catalog department and in teaching is thoroughly qualified to treat of the subject.

The Committee recommends therefore that the Editorial Committee get into communication with Miss Hyde with the view of making financially possible the completion of the text-book at the earliest possible time, preferably before the beginning

of the next school year.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

Harriet E. Howe
Chairman

Mary L. Sutliff
Isabella K. Rhodes

The ordering and modifying of Library of Congress cards seem now to be included at all schools, according to answers to Question 6. Question 7 shows the surprisingly low amount of time now spent on the classified catalog.

The answers to question 7a-c, and e show that still more emphasis could be put here, i.e. on the organization and administration of the cataloging department. The student should be taught not only to catalog books correctly, but that she must relate herself to her particular group of associates, and to the needs of the library in which she is working. In the list of qualifications needed for a successful career in cataloging the following were given, in November-December 1923, a median vote of "above average" by the 35 Head Catalogers:

MORE THAN AN AVERAGE AMOUNT OF THESE QUALITIES NEEDED

BY A CATALOGER

Ability to cooperate; to be tactful	Promptness; punctuality
Self control; patience	Common sense; good judgment
Courtesy	Initiative, resourcefulness
Ability to follow directions intelligently	Imagination; foresight in planning
Ability to direct others	Speed in work and thought
Responsibility; Trustworthiness	Perseverance; industry; productivity

THESE ARE AN AVERAGE AMOUNT OF THESE QUALITIES NEEDED BY A
CATALOGUER (cont.)

Adaptability to change, surprise	Accuracy
Confidence in own ability	Neatness
Reference work	Orderliness; system
Ability to attend to details	Professional ideals and ambitions

Library Education

If the preparation time is carried on as suggested above, the student will have more of an idea of what qualities are needed, and which ones she possesses. However the necessity for spending a considerable amount of time on the discussion of the up-to-date practices in the modern department, the relation of the workers to each other, the way in which modifications of practice should be made in order to fit the differing conditions found, can not be stressed too much, if socially minded assistants are to be available for the openings occurring.

In Dr Williamson's now famous report, the teaching staff in library schools was severely criticised. Taking the items called for in his table on p.35, the fourteen cataloging teachers include ten college graduates, thirteen library school graduates, six teaching in the same school from which they were graduated, and a majority who have had library experience that would seem valuable to them in teaching. What other experience or training in teaching they may have had was not brought out by the questionnaire used. In view of Dr Williamson's state-

ments it might be safe to assume that few of them have had any systematic study of teaching.

The criticism based on the number who are now teaching at their Alma Mater needs other facts to prove that this is a fault. Of these six teachers, two had been in actual cataloging work away from the school for ten years or more. This can not be called serious "inbreeding". On the other hand one of the six has spent all but six months of her four years of experience, in the library of the institution from which she was graduated. The difference is apparent at once, but even the latter case may not have been a poor appointment.

The committee would recommend that every effort be made to discover among the younger generation now in the cataloging departments, those who are capable or potential teachers, and that these young people be encouraged and urged to prepare themselves to take the positions made available by new schools or by the resignations of the older teachers. These young people should be college graduates, with library school education, and preferably have had experience both in University and Public Library cataloging departments as head catalogers or first assistants, and in teaching.

Other points were brought out by the 1923 questionnaire but as most of them were on methods of class room procedure they may well be discussed by the teachers of cataloging,

themselves. Since many of the other teachers saw the list, and commented upon it, and as some of these comments were to the effect that many of the suggestions sounded as if they were aimed for primary teachers, the Chairman can only say that these methods were in use in the Harvard University Graduate School of Education where she was studying this winter.

The report is respectfully submitted.

Isabella K. Rhodes

Mary L. Sutliff

Harriet E. Howe, Chairman.

June '24/150

Discussion of the report followed. The use of completion tests at Simmons with satisfactory results was reported by Miss Howe. Miss Hyde said she considered typing a tool of the trade and was in favor of encouraging students to learn the touch system. Comments on the unit card followed. Motion was made, seconded, and carried that the report of the committee be accepted.

Degrees. The report for the year of the Committee on Degrees was presented by Mr. Wyer, Chairman, as follows:

(1) During the past year, the attention of the Committee was called to the fact that the University of Pittsburgh carried this statement in its General Catalog 1922-23: "Graduates of the curriculum in library economy received the degree of Bachelor of Library Economy". Before taking the matter up with the University authorities, it seemed well to write the Pittsburgh Carnegie Library School, as it is in connection with the course there that the University offers a degree for library work. A prompt reply from Miss Brotherton, principal of the School, indicated that they had already taken up the question of degrees with the University and made protest against granting the degree of Bachelor of Library Economy for this course, and that it had then been decided that the degree to be awarded should be Bachelor of Arts. The degree of Bachelor of Library Economy has never been granted by the University of Pittsburgh. Miss Brotherton also forwarded a copy of the latest catalog of the University of Pittsburgh, where the statement in regard to the degree is as follows: "Upon completion of the four years' curriculum the student receives the bachelor's degree from the University and the certificate of the Carnegie Library School". This is quite in accord with the feeling of the Association.

(2) The Syracuse University Library School reports action within the present month as follows:

The University Senate passed a resolution on June 5 that the announcement be made in the next bulletin of the library school that beginning with the year 1925 only students for the degree course shall be admitted, thus automatically eliminating the certificate course now given, the advance date permitting those students now taking this course to complete their work.

This seems directly to affect the professional degree granted by Syracuse and to conserve its meaning and integrity.

(3) The following word comes under date of June 4 from the Chairman on Academic Degrees of the Association of American Universities:

"I take pleasure in advising you that I have held conference with some of the members of the Committee on Academic and Professional Higher Degrees of the Association of American Universities throughout the spring and that I expect to forward to you within a week the opinion of the Committee on the degree proposals pending before the Association of American Library Schools. In the meantime I may say that the final proposals seem to be fairly in accord with the policies of the Association of American Universities."

This is in sequence to several exchanges of letters during the year, on our part urging consideration of and action on the matter and on his part explaining why the Committee has not been able to meet or to act.

Respectfully submitted. J.I. Wyer, Chairman
F.L. Windsor
June R. Donnelly

June, 1924

Dr. Wyer added that a telegram just received from Prof. Loisner, Chairman of the Committee on professional and higher degrees of the A.A. U., stated "Communication concerning your degree report mailed in duplicate to Albany and Saratoga Springs". This communication had not been as yet received. Mr. Wyer suggested sending later the information to member schools.

Miss Donnelly suggested that action taken by the Temporary Library Training Board may modify the opinions of last year.

Dr. Wyer replied that at the moment the report stands as it did last year.

Mr. Reece made the motion to accept the report with the request that as soon as the report of the Committee of the Association of American Universities has been considered by the Committee on Degrees Dr. Wyer send a report to the member schools. This motion was seconded and carried.

-38-

Equivalent of four-year high school course. The report of the Committee to define equivalent of "four year high school" was read by Miss Barker in the absence of the chairman, Miss Rathbone, as follows:

Feeling that what was needed first was an understanding of the generally accepted meaning of the phrase, the chairman wrote each of the library schools the following letter in December last:

"I have been asked to take the chairmanship of the committee to define the equivalent of a high school education, and think as a preliminary it would be well to ascertain what the schools are now regarding as the equivalent of a high school education. Will you therefore please let me know if you invariably understand it to be four full years of study beyond the grammar grade, whether pursued in a regular high school, in a private school, or with private tutors? How much credit would you give to travel, and do you feel that library experience should count in estimating an equivalent, and if so, what kinds and how much? Or do you feel that the ability to pass your entrance examinations is in itself the demonstration of an education equivalent to a high school?"

To this were received replies that indicate so wide a range of interpretation as to make their combination into a definition acceptable to all an almost impossible task.

The schools may be grouped into those so connected with a college or university as to necessitate conforming their practice to the general policy of that institution, and the schools that have practically a free hand in settling their own standards.. Curiously enough some of the latter group appear rather less flexible in their requirements than the former. Colleges, apparently, judging from reports from Washington State University, Syracuse, and Simmons, are willing to accept either the ability to pass an entrance examination or the unusual experience of the candidate as an equivalent to graduation from a high school, the adviser in the Wisconsin University office going so far as to state on being asked for a definition of an equivalent, "We haven't any, and I would hesitate to give one, for the moment you define it there would be no discretion left to those who had to act on equivalent offerings".

and the other two are the same as the first two. The first two are the same as the first two. The first two are the same as the first two.

The first two are the same as the first two. The first two are the same as the first two. The first two are the same as the first two.

That sentence expresses the views of the chairman and Miss Barker and in agreement with it is the following statement from Western Reserve. "We consider the ability to pass our entrance examinations is evidence that one must have an education which is an equivalent to a high school education. My own feeling is that this is a much better and surer way to measure their preparation, if combined with a personal interview, than to ask for credentials of study, either under tutors or in a private school, and we have found that this plan works in a satisfactory way".

The Committee therefore recommends that the Association does not commit itself to a definite statement of what constitutes equivalency, but recognizing that every school is interested in maintaining the highest standards their circumstances permit, leave the meaning of equivalency undefined and to be settled by each school as hitherto.

Josephine A. Rathbone, Chairman
Tommy Dora Barker
Mara C. Brotherton

Mr. Reece - Not satisfied with report of committee. Thinks whatever may be submitted as equivalent ought to be very clearly defined. Against accepting travel and wide reading for equivalent, since students are likely to reveal lack of experience in directed study, in applying themselves, and in arranging programs. Ought to take these things into account.

Miss Tyler - Thinks examination is the best test. Entrance examinations are used for admission to colleges. College entrance examination boards set examinations for admission and measure equivalent of high school education. So far, entrance examinations seem to define equivalent.

Mr. Stevens - Our school departs far from standards in the matter of examination of students. Examine them as individuals. Preparation, intelligence, experience, etc., is what we go by. Thinks it a mistake that high school course should be prerequisite

President - St Louis only once departed from custom of four year requirement.

Mr. Windsor - Illinois takes account of the fact of whether college from which students graduate require four years high school prerequisite. If not, student is not admitted. Special students may take courses by being admitted as special, or unclassified students on probation. The unusual person should be cared for even in most rigid standards. Pratt insists on personality. This is good for Pratt and the library profession. Would have better results, however, if personality tests were made only on high school graduates, or even on college graduates.

Mr. Stevens - We have admitted students who have never entered high school but who have had private tutoring.

Mr. Windsor - There have been cases like that in Illinois.

Miss Howe - What are entrance examinations for? Simply to test what students have learned in high school?

Mr. Windsor - If student has equivalent, have him take the college entrance examination. Library School entrance examination may incidentally test what they have learned in high school, but most educators would agree that they are not tests of what people learned there.

Miss Jackson - Aren't examination questions not only to find out what the pupil knows, but also, his ability to pass along his knowledge?

Mr. Bostwick - What is the purpose of Library School training?

To turn out trained and fit librarians. To eliminate the unfit. This should be considered in examinations, and through out the course. Should graduate none who would not be good librarians. One of the merits of Pratt is that the unfit have been eliminated.

Mr. Stevens - Examination has no regard for what students have had in course of study, but is a revelation of the student's mind and not of student's facts. Would be disappointed at Pratt if they had to have all students college graduates. Students not college graduates almost always are the kind that Pratt wants most, and they have passed the course with credit.

It was moved, seconded, and the motion carried that the report be accepted.

Miss Tyler moved amendment - "That report be referred back to committee in hope of presentment of unified report next year" As report now stands, there is a majority and minority report.

Motion seconded and carried.

Field work. Miss Donnelly reported that the Committee on Field Work had no report to present.

Miss Sutliff made the motion that committee be continued another year.

Motion seconded, and carried.

Re-examination of member schools. The President presented the Report of the Executive Committee on the re-examination of member schools as follows:

The re-examination of member schools went forward this past year in accordance with the policy and plans formulated by the Executive committee of 1922-23.

The three schools next in order for examination were New York State Library School, Pratt Institute School of Library Science, and the St. Louis Library School.

The material was presented, duly considered, and accepted as satisfying the requirements, stated in our constitution.

Respectfully submitted by the Exxcutive
Committee,

Mrs. Harriet P. Sawyer, Pres
Ernest J. Reace
Frances Simpson
Alice S. Tyler
Margaret S. Williams, Sec.

June, 1924

Application for membership. The President announced that application for membership had been received from the Drexel Institute Library School and presented the following report from the Executive committee on this application :

The Drexel Institute Library School has been found to meet all the constitutional requirements for membership in the Association of American Library Schools subject to further information on one point. The weekly schedule of student work is indicated as twelve class hours or the equivalent, which, of course, is somewhat lower than the number commonly found in college and universities. If this weekly schedule is the one prevailing in other departments of Drexel Institute and if four years of such twelve hour weeks are sufficient to enable a student to qualify for the degree given by the Institute in other departments, the requirements of our Association would seem to be met.

The Executive Committee, therefore, recommends the acceptance of the credentials of the Drexel school subject to satisfactory information on this point.

This recommendation is herewith passed on to the Executive committee of 1924-25 as provided in the constitution.

Mrs. Harriet P. Sawyer, Pres.
Margaret S. Williams, Sec.
Ernest J. Reece
Frances Simpson
Alice S. Tyler
Executive committee, 1923-24

Book selection. The Committee on Book selection, Miss Corinne Bacon, chairman, Miss Helen Haines, Miss Susie Lee Crumley, had in hand extensive questionnaires distributed to the member schools during the past year.

Miss Bacon read some of the answers and spoke informally of some of the findings of the committee. A more formal report was promised at a later date.

Miss Crumley reported on Children's work. She had found that only three schools include children's literature with Book selection and that children's literature is often included in a general course on library work with children.

Miss Tyler moved that the report be accepted and the committee thanked and continued. This motion was seconded and carried.

Miss Bacon asked that schools suggest other points which the Committee might take up.

Report of the Temporary library training board. The meeting was thrown open for the discussion of the report of the Temporary library training board of the A.L.A.

The two following resolutions were passed:

Resolved, that in case the Council of the A.L.A. approves the recommendations of the Temporary Library Training Board, the President of the A.A.L.S. communicate to the Board of Education for Librarianship the desire of this Association to cooperate with the Board under the provision of (4) (i) (See American library association. Temporary library training board. Report. May 20, 1924. p.7: "that the Board of Education for Librarianship shall establish close relations with other bodies having similar purposes.)

Resolved, that the A.A.L.S., welcomes the contribution of the program of the Temporary Library Training Board as a statement of ideals of library training as it applies to library schools, and suggests that the material be referred to the A.A.L.S. for study of methods by which these ideals may be carried into effect.

Mr. Windsor suggested that a winter meeting of the A.A.L.S. would probably be desirable during the coming year. Others agreed.

Mr. Windsor further suggested that some of the papers presented at the meeting be prepared by the secretary or authors for publication in library periodicals.

Treasurer's report. The treasurer's report showed a balance on hand of \$285.58. The report was accepted.

Miss Tyler made the motion that the Association express appreciation of the hospitality enjoyed and give a vote of thanks to the faculty of the New York State Library School.

Mr. Windsor raised the question of basis of membership in the A.A.L.S. Now there is an institutional membership only. He made the motion that the incoming Exxcutive Board consider whether it be advisable to change the constitution so as to provide for a different sort of membership. Altho there is an institutional membership, the library school vote in this Association could not be legally authorized in settling any matters connected with the institutions with which library school is connected without consent of trustees. Question of basis of membership-should it be institutional membership or individual membership?

Motion seconded, and carried.

The President announced the new officers chosen by the Executive board as follows: for President, Miss Crumley; for Secretary-Treasurer, Miss Williams to succeed herself for the next period of three years.

On motion, the meeting was adjourned.

Harriet P. Sawyer, President

Margaret S. Williams, Secretary-Treasurer



3 0112 061978869

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
4000